

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/966,923 09/28/2001 Zhijian Lu 01 P 14628 US (8055-108) 5067 7590 07/27/2004 EXAMINER F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LL C SODERQUIST, ARLEN 1900 HEMPSTEAD TURNPIKE SUITE 501 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER EAST MEADOW, NY 11554 1743

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/966,923	LU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Arlen Soderquist	1743
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		
THE REPLY FILED 12 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFF of extension and the corresponding amounth the shortened statutory period for reply once later than three months after the mailing	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office extension.
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:		
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ı better form for appeal by mater	ially reducing or simplifying the
<ul><li>(d) ☐ they present additional claims without cancelin NOTE:</li></ul>	ng a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-6 and 8-12</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	1 Salestin 10	

ARLEN SODERQUIST PRIMARY EXAMINER Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because of the following. Relative to the differences between optical and mass spectrometric methods, the Agarwal reference shows that one of skill in the art recognizes that both analysis techniques are available and applicable to the same problem in spite of their differences. This also says that one of skill in the art recognizes that the two techniques have differences and advantages and can utilize the advantages of both. Examiner would also point out that the instant claims do not limit the method to the situations that are described on page 6, lines 6-23 of the instant specification. Therefore applicant's argument is not commensurate in scope with the claims. Relative to claim 4, examiner points to the Bennett refertence which detects CuCl, a compound formed (generated) from the copper dopant used. Thus, the primary reference is noit deficient in the limitation that applicant argues as missing. It is noted that the claims presented are not amended.